



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

**PLEASANT GROVE CITY  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES  
DECEMBER 14, 2023**

**PRESENT:** Chair Dustin Phillips, Karla Patten, Todd Fugal, Jim Martineau, Alicia Redding

**STAFF:** Jacob Hawkins, City Planner (participated via telephone); Aaron Wilson, City Engineer; Paul Douglass, Planning Technician; Kara Kresser, Permit Technician; Christina Gregory, Planning and Zoning Assistant

**EXCUSED:** Commissioner Jeffrey Butler; Commissioner Wendy Shirley; Daniel Cardenas, Community Development Director

Chair Dustin Phillips called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**REGULAR SESSION**

**Commission Business:**

**1. Pledge of Allegiance and Opening Remarks:** Commissioner Redding led the Pledge of Allegiance. Commissioner Fugal offered the opening remarks. Chair Phillips welcomed members of the public who were present.

**2. Agenda Approval.**

Chair Phillips reported that agenda items 6 through 10 would be continued.

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Martineau moved to ACCEPT tonight’s agenda for items 1 through 5 with items 6 through 10 being moved to the January 11, 2024, meeting. Commissioner Patten seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

**3. Staff Reports:**

- **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved to ACCEPT the Staff Reports with one correction. Item 2 includes a heading on the analysis that references the R1-8 requirements that should be R1-9. Commissioner Redding seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The motion carried.

1 **4. Declaration of Conflicts and Abstentions from Commission Members.**

2  
3 There were no declarations or abstentions.

4  
5 **ITEM 1 – Public Hearing: Preliminary Subdivision Plat – Located at approximately 325 East**  
6 **700 North**

7 **(Monkey Town Neighborhood)**

8 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Katherine Duvall for a One-Lot Preliminary Subdivision  
9 Plat, called Duvall Subdivision Plat ‘A’ on 0.25 Acres, Approximately located at 325 East 700 North  
10 in the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone.

11  
12 Planning Technician, Paul Douglass, presented the Staff Report and stated that the request is for a  
13 one-lot subdivision. The applicant is primarily eliminating nuisance strips and making sure that all  
14 street frontage improvements are made. Nuisance strips were described as parcels that overlap  
15 properties or are leftover between properties and visible on aerial maps. The proposed subdivision  
16 meets all of the requirements for the R1-8 zone in terms of lot area and width. Staff recommended  
17 approval.

18  
19 The applicant was present but did not comment.

20  
21 Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.

22  
23 *Lonnie Adams* reported that the east property line is adjacent to the west property line of the subject  
24 property. He asked if the City plans to require the applicant to install curb and gutter. City Engineer,  
25 Aaron Wilson, reported that the applicant will be installing curb and gutter in front of the lot. Mr.  
26 Adams asked about mitigation due to the existing slope. Mr. Wilson explained that a drainage swale  
27 will be put in that will run down to the inlet on the corner so that the drainage from the curb and gutter  
28 will be taken directly to the inlet. Mr. Adams identified an existing cement retaining wall on the plans  
29 and asked what would prevent debris from the subject property from flowing onto his property. Mr.  
30 Wilson stated that the applicant will be required to install a berm to retain the water. Mr. Adams  
31 claimed that it would take more than a berm to accomplish that. Currently, there is a cement retaining  
32 wall with a fence on top that is adequate. He recommended that the same thing be installed along  
33 that border. Mr. Wilson offered to look at the plan with Mr. Adams after the meeting to discuss the  
34 matter further. Mr. Adams stated that the alternative would be for the existing fence and retaining  
35 wall to remain, which would leave 10 feet that could be used. He was willing to live with that, which  
36 would save the applicant on building costs. He offered to meet with the City and the applicant to  
37 discuss the matter further. Mr. Wilson explained that one of the conditions is that all Planning,  
38 Engineering, and Zoning requirements are met, which would allow for Mr. Adams to meet with the  
39 applicant and staff. Chair Phillips stated that he would also want to see drainage for the front curb  
40 and gutter.

41  
42 There were no further public comments. The Chair closed the public hearing and invited the  
43 Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item, or he would entertain a motion if  
44 no further discussion was necessary.

45  
46 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved that the Planning Commission forward a POSITIVE  
47 recommendation of approval to the City Council on the request of Katherine Duvall for a subdivision

1 plat called Duvall Subdivision Plat 'A', located at approximately 325 East 700 North on property  
2 zoned R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of  
3 the Staff Report, and as modified by the condition below:

- 4  
5 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

6  
7 Commissioner Martineau seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The  
8 motion carried.

9  
10 **ITEM 2 – Public Hearing: Preliminary Subdivision Plat – Located at approximately 675 East**  
11 **700 North**

12 **(Monkey Town Neighborhood)**

13 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Bryson Seifert for a One-Lot Preliminary Subdivision Plat,  
14 called Seifert Addition Subdivision Plat 'A' on 0.59 Acres, approximately located at 675 East 700  
15 North in the R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) Zone.

16  
17 Mr. Douglass presented the Staff Report and stated that the above item is similar to the previous one.  
18 The applicant, Bryson Seifert is proposing a one-lot subdivision for the purpose of eliminating  
19 nuisance strips and making street frontage improvements. An aerial map was displayed. The request  
20 was found to meet all zoning requirements. Staff recommended approval.

21  
22 The applicant was present to answer questions.

23  
24 Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The Chair closed the  
25 public hearing and invited the Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item, or  
26 he would entertain a motion if no further discussion was necessary.

27  
28 **MOTION:** Commissioner Patten moved that the Planning Commission forward a POSITIVE  
29 recommendation of approval to the City Council on the request of Bryson Seifert for a subdivision  
30 plat called Seifert Addition Subdivision Plat 'A', located at approximately 675 East 700 North on  
31 property zoned R1-9 (Single-Family Residential) Zone; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and  
32 findings of the Staff Report, and as modified by the condition below:

- 33  
34 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

35  
36 Commissioner Redding seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The  
37 motion carried.

38  
39 **ITEM 3 – Public Hearing: Preliminary Subdivision Plat – Located at approximately 1025 North**  
40 **600 West**

41 **(String Town Neighborhood)**

42 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Scott Flora for a Four-Lot Preliminary Subdivision Plat  
43 called Bullock Subdivision Plat 'B' on 0.99 Acres, approximately located at 1025 North 600 West in  
44 the R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone.

45  
46 Mr. Douglass presented the Staff Report and stated that the property involves a deeper lot on which  
47 the applicant is requesting to develop three flag lots. An aerial map was displayed. The proposed

1 flag lot stem will be between the home on the north side of the property. The remaining three lots  
2 will be in the rear. Each lot must be a minimum of 85 feet wide and have a lot area of 8,000 square  
3 feet. The applicant was found to meet all requirements. Staff recommended approval.  
4

5 Commissioner Fugal commented that two of the lots are very close to the minimum requirements.  
6 He asked if staff was confident in those numbers. City Planner, Jacob Hawkins stated that the square  
7 footages are actual and greater than the required minimums.  
8

9 Commissioner Martineau asked if the proposed hammerhead meets the Fire Code. Staff confirmed  
10 that it does.  
11

12 The applicant's representative was present but had no comments.  
13

14 Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.  
15

16 *Lillian Shephard* reported that she lives on the north side of the subdivision. Her concern was that it  
17 has been a spillway and asked how it would be drained off as there is a dip in the property. If it is  
18 straightened out, she questioned where the water will go. She asked if the property was wide enough  
19 for a road. Chair Phillips explained that the existing home will be considered the first lot and is part  
20 of the subdivision. Mr. Wilson stated that in terms of water flow, the applicants are proposing to  
21 bring in fill to fix the dip in the property. There will also be some retention on the property. Most of  
22 the drainage will flow through a pipe to the existing ditch on the shoulder of 600 West. Ms. Shepherd  
23 asked if the applicant was responsible for the fence. Mr. Wilson was not sure but indicated that all  
24 City requirements will need to be met.  
25

26 There were no further public comments. The Chair closed the public hearing and invited the  
27 Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item, or he would entertain a motion if  
28 no further discussion was necessary.  
29

30 **MOTION:** Commissioner Redding moved that the Planning Commission forward a POSITIVE  
31 recommendation of approval to the City Council on the request of Scott Flora for a subdivision plat  
32 called Bullock Subdivision Plat 'B', located at approximately 1025 North 600 West on property zoned  
33 R1-8 (Single-Family Residential) Zone; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the  
34 Staff Report, and as modified by the condition below:  
35

- 36 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

37  
38 Commissioner Patten seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted "Aye". The  
39 motion carried.  
40

1 **ITEM 4 – Public Hearing: Conditional Use Permit – Located at 597 South Pleasant Grove**  
2 **Boulevard**  
3 **(Sam White’s Lane Neighborhood)**

4 Public Hearing to Consider the Request of Jamie Wood for a Conditional Use Permit for Use #6830,  
5 Special Training and Schooling, located at approximately 597 South Pleasant Grove Boulevard in  
6 The Grove Zone – Commercial Sales Subdistrict.  
7

8 Mr. Douglass reported that a few months earlier, the Commission heard a request for a Conditional  
9 Use Permit for the property for a preschool use. The subject property is located in the Grove  
10 Commercial Sales Subdistrict and the applicant’s request is listed as a Conditional Use. The  
11 applicant, Jamie Wood, recently moved her salon business from another location to this one. In the  
12 process, she reached out to staff to see if she could expand the business to also include aesthetician  
13 training, which would fall under Use #6830-Special Training and Schooling. For preschool use, the  
14 only condition that was required was that there be adequate parking for patrons. For the proposed  
15 use, staff recommended approval as long as all parking requirements are met. Of the total 97 parking  
16 stalls, there are 23 developable spaces between this suite and one more that has not yet been occupied.  
17 The training will include tutoring in permanent makeup, microblading, laser, chemical peels, and  
18 laser hair removal. The applicant expects to have up to 10 students at a time with the same hours as  
19 the salon. In the event the applicant has 10 students, an additional 7 parking spaces will be required  
20 at a ratio of 2 parking spaces for every 3 students in addition to 1 for each staff member. Staff  
21 recommended approval. Parking issues were discussed. Mr. Hawkins explained that with the  
22 proposed use, 81 spaces will be occupied of the total 97 stalls. 16 will remain for the additional suite.  
23

24 The applicant, Jamie Wood, reported that she is a Master Esthetician Instructor with the State of Utah.  
25 In 2017, she began microblading and discovered that students need better training than they are  
26 offered in Esthetician School. She hopes to provide the best training for her students. Students will  
27 pay tuition for Master Esthetician Training. A question was raised as to whether there was a potential  
28 for more than 10 students. Ms. Wood stated that she does not expect to.  
29

30 Chair Phillips opened the public hearing. There were no public comments. The Chair closed the  
31 public hearing and invited the Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item, or  
32 he would entertain a motion if no further discussion was necessary.  
33

34 **MOTION:** Commissioner Fugal moved that the Planning Commission forward a POSITIVE  
35 recommendation of approval to the City Council for the request of Jamie Wood for a Conditional Use  
36 Permit to allow Use #6830 – Special Training and Schooling on property zoned The Grove-  
37 Commercial Sales Subdistrict, located at 597 South Pleasant Grove Boulevard; and adopting the  
38 exhibits, conditions, and findings of the Staff Report, and as modified by the conditions below:  
39

- 40 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.
- 41
- 42 2. All parking stall requirements are met.
- 43

44 Commissioner Martineau seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
45 motion carried.  
46

1 **ITEM 5 – Public Hearing: Vicinity Plan Amendment – Located in the Quadrant Surrounded**  
2 **by Locust Avenue, 900 South, 1150 East, and 1000 South (Scratch Grave Neighborhood)** Public  
3 Hearing to Consider the Request of Pleasant Grove City for a Vicinity Plan Amendment, located  
4 within the Area Delineated by Locust Avenue, 900 South, 1150 East, and 1000 South, in the R1-9  
5 (Single Family Residential) Zone.  
6

7 Mr. Douglass presented the Staff Report and stated that previously the City adopted a Vicinity Plan  
8 that outlined potential development for larger residential lots. The intent was to ensure that if any  
9 larger properties are subdivided or developed, any new lots would have adequate access and service.  
10 Currently, if any of the identified lots are subdivided, they should be developed in a specific manner.  
11 Recently, applicants from the area have approached staff with the intent to subdivide the property.  
12 After reviewing some of the proposed concept plans and taking several other factors into account,  
13 staff found that the existing Vicinity Plan could be modified to better address the existing property  
14 lines and consider how potential future development will be provided with adequate access and  
15 service.  
16

17 Mr. Douglass reiterated that it is a Vicinity Plan and not a subdivision. If any of the properties are  
18 developed, the proposed Vicinity Plan identifies where accesses should be located to meet the City's  
19 requirements for access and service. If any property owners in the area are anticipating subdividing  
20 the property, the Vicinity Plan will serve as a guideline in the design as long as all zoning and  
21 engineering requirements are met. Careful consideration was placed on the design of the Vicinity  
22 Plan. The updated version takes into account existing property lines as they are today, removes cul-  
23 de-sacs from the previous version, and accounts for the unique circumstances around how future  
24 properties south of 900 South will receive services such as culinary water, sewer, stormwater, and  
25 irrigation. Staff recommended approval.  
26

27 Commissioner Fugal asked staff if they are confident that they are not landlocking any properties by  
28 eliminating one of the thru roads between 900 South and 1000 South with the proposed Vicinity Plan  
29 if they are developed in the future. Mr. Hawkins confirmed that no properties will be landlocked as  
30 a result of the proposed change. He had a more detailed drawing showing how each property could  
31 potentially be subdivided. He noted that they are really just focusing on the access.  
32

33 Chair Phillips verified that they are not changing any property lines. The action taken tonight also  
34 does not approve any future subdivision requests.  
35

36 Chair Phillips opened the public hearing.  
37

38 *Juan Castillo* gave his address as 1110 East 900 South. His understanding was that the City is  
39 providing a general layout for how a development would look. He was concerned that a proposal was  
40 being put forward for a relatively small neighborhood and finding only now how it would lay out. It  
41 seemed to him that there ought to be some consideration for an additional thru street. He did not feel  
42 that input from the neighbors had been requested. Mr. Castillo asked if the amended Vicinity Plan  
43 envisions access to 1000 South. Mr. Wilson stated that the intent was for it to connect all the way  
44 through. It was clarified that access to 1000 South will be possible but the cul-de-sacs will be  
45 removed. Mr. Castillo was surprised to hear that there had been some subdivision applications and  
46 asked where that was proposed. Mr. Wilson stated that there are no pending applications. There have  
47 been requests over the past two or three years to meet with staff about a potential concept plan. In

1 those cases, staff has provided direction on how to move forward, if desired. There were no formal  
2 applications underway.

3  
4 *Sterling Naunann* asked if a portion could be developed rather than the entire area and if the road  
5 would have to go all the way through before anyone could develop on the property. Mr. Wilson stated  
6 that it would depend on the location of the site being developed. Mr. Naunann did not want the road  
7 to be developed and did not support what was proposed. He asked about the area behind his home  
8 and potential access. Mr. Wilson stated that the primary access will remain where it is. Lindon City  
9 will ultimately decide that but he did not expect Mr. Naunann to have access onto that road from his  
10 property.

11  
12 *Eve Werner*, a 725 North resident, asked about the proposed road. She stated that she has a very busy  
13 road in front of her property and potentially another in her backyard. She stated that it would impact  
14 a full block and result in the residents being sandwiched between two busy roads. She thought it  
15 made more sense for the lots on the opposite side to back up to their fence line rather than put a road  
16 through. Commissioner Martineau stated that doing so would require splitting the lots in half, which  
17 would make most of them unbuildable. The current zoning of the adjoining properties is R1-9, which  
18 allows for 9,000 square-foot minimum lot sizes. Ms. Werner felt that the proposed wording was  
19 overly vague. Mr. Wilson stated that the detail in the plan caused more confusion. The intent is to  
20 provide general guidance. It was noted that for this matter the City is the applicant. Ms. Werner  
21 asked how the City will reduce the impact on homeowners. Chair Phillips stated that the Vicinity  
22 Plan is a guideline to show where the road will be anticipated. The intent was to clean up the Vicinity  
23 Plan and improve it for future development.

24  
25 In response to a question, Mr. Wilson stated that the proposed road has been on the Master Plans for  
26 both Lindon City and Pleasant Grove for some time. Because it is a continuation of North Town  
27 Boulevard, the County's Long-Range Plan shows it as continuing onward and into Orem. It is a  
28 regional collector road. The intent is for it to help direct traffic to major roads. Ms. Werner stated  
29 that traffic travels very fast already at 45 MPH and asked how it can be made safe. Commissioner  
30 Fugal stated that when it is built out, an Environmental Impact Study or Traffic Study will be  
31 performed to address those issues. The outcome will ultimately depend on what is developed and  
32 when.

33  
34 *Royal West* reported that when the area was sold, Lindon and Pleasant Grove required a fence be paid  
35 for down on the south side of the road. The requirement has since been removed. The fence was  
36 intended to serve as a barrier. He noted that the proposed road will impact everyone. Mr. West  
37 clarified that the fence was a condition of development.

38  
39 *Kelly Naumann* asked if there would be homes facing south on the proposed road. It was confirmed  
40 that there could be. Commissioner Fugal commented that the previous plan caused confusion and  
41 was not specifically how the developer would have to develop the property. If desired, the homes  
42 could ultimately face the road.

43  
44 *Terry Tenney* reported that she and her husband own property in Pleasant Grove and Lindon. They  
45 currently reside in Lindon. She was concerned that there are currently no plans in place for  
46 development on the property, however, Angela Kelson has purchased a lot north of the proposed road  
47 as well as much of the easement. Mrs. Tenney asked why someone would do that if they did not plan

1 to develop. Chair Phillips stated that this person may plan to develop but no formal application has  
2 been submitted to the City. Tonight, they are simply discussing the City plan.

3  
4 Mrs. Tenney asked what the R1-9 plan is to be amended to. Chair Phillips explained that the zoning  
5 is not changing, which addresses the minimum size of the lot. Commissioner Martineau reported that  
6 the previous plan included five cul-de-sacs. The amendment would eliminate the cul-de-sacs and  
7 result in the roads going through. It was clarified that no lot sizes are being approved. The request  
8 was only to amend the Vicinity Plan. If no development takes place, no road will be built. However,  
9 in anticipation of potential future development, there could be a need for a road and the Master Plan  
10 provides that opportunity. No consideration was being given to changing the zoning from R1-9 or  
11 the lot sizes. Mrs. Tenney wanted to preserve the quality of the area and protect against high-density  
12 housing.

13  
14 *Ryan Slade* asked about the fence that will be necessary on the south side of the road and if it will still  
15 be required. Chair Phillips was not aware of the history of the fence or what was required so the  
16 decision tonight should not affect that. What is existing should remain. The intent behind eliminating  
17 the cul-de-sacs was to better control traffic. If the lots sell, the developer would have to put the roads  
18 in. What is proposed takes into consideration property lines that currently exist, which results in less  
19 of an impact on each individual property. Mr. Wilson reported that the culinary water will be serviced  
20 by Lindon. Everything that is not currently served on 900 South is serviced by Lindon City to the  
21 south of the lots for culinary water and sewer. Utility services were discussed.

22  
23 *Matt Stokes* owns property in the area and acknowledged the noise and traffic on either side of the  
24 properties as well as the potential danger for children. He asked if the traffic would be traveling as  
25 fast. He did not understand why the residents would not have access to the road. Mr. Wilson stated  
26 that access will depend on where Mr. Stokes' home is located. He stated that those details will be  
27 addressed between Pleasant Grove and Lindon to determine whether additional access to the roadway  
28 will be allowed. The road is meant to be a larger collector-type road. They typically try to limit the  
29 number of accesses to the extent possible. There will likely be some properties that require access  
30 and some already have access. Lots in Lindon already have frontage and access to the Lindon City  
31 street so they will not be granted an additional access on this side.

32  
33 *Matt Steubner* asked if Lindon City still owns the property on the south side where the new road is  
34 envisioned. Commissioner Martineau stated that there is a small section that Lindon owns. The rest  
35 is private. Mr. Wilson reported that staff met with representatives from Lindon City last week who  
36 were aware of what was proposed. Chair Phillips clarified that the proposed road is not going in now.  
37 Mr. Steubner stated that there are a lot of concerns with what is proposed on the part of Lindon City  
38 residents. He thanked the Commission for allowing their voices to be heard.

39  
40 *Clint Gelson* reported that he purchased the Storey property and expressed support for the concept.  
41 He owns property at 1080 East and stated that the new crossroad is possible. When they purchased  
42 the Storey Estate it came with a parcel that there have been questions about. Their intent was to  
43 develop flag lots in the back for their children. They have not been contacted by anyone from the  
44 City about the proposed road. Mr. Gelson had no objection to the proposed Vicinity Plan  
45 Amendment. They have spoken to the City but have not yet submitted a formal application for the  
46 flag lots. Chair Phillips stated that it will become a question when Mr. Gelson seeks to develop.



1 *Doug Degelbeck* reported that they submitted a formal application to develop two flag lots about three  
2 months ago and paid the fee. Because of the proposed roadway, they put the project on hold. What  
3 they envision will change slightly as a result of the road going to 1000 South. They would like to  
4 move forward with two lots as soon as possible.

5  
6 There were no further public comments. The Chair closed the public hearing and invited the  
7 Commission to either continue the discussion regarding this item, or he would entertain a motion if  
8 no further discussion was necessary.

9  
10 Commissioner Fugal commented that the proposed design is better than it was previously. He stated  
11 that it has always been known that 1000 South was intended to be a collector road. He considered  
12 what was proposed to be a better use of the land and the planning for sewer and drainage.

13  
14 **MOTION:** Commissioner Martineau moved that the Planning Commission recommend  
15 APPROVAL for the request of Pleasant Grove City for a Vicinity Plan Amendment for the property  
16 bounded by Locust Avenue, 900 South, 1150 East, and 1000 South in the R1-9 (Single-Family  
17 Residential) Zone; and adopting the exhibits, conditions, and findings of the Staff Report, and as  
18 modified by the condition below:

- 19  
20 1. All Final Planning, Engineering, and Fire Department requirements are met.

21  
22 Commissioner Redding seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
23 motion carried.

24  
25 **ITEM 6 – Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment – Section 11-3-4-B.1: Cul-De-Sacs**  
26 **(City Wide)**

27 Public Hearing to Consider a Request from Pleasant Grove City to Amend City Code Section 11-34-  
28 B.1, Cul-De-Sacs. The City is proposing to Remove the Possibility of Extending Cul-de-Sacs Beyond  
29 their Maximum Permitted Length.

30  
31 The above item was continued to January 11, 2024.

32  
33 **ITEM 7 – Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment – Section 10-9-C: Medium Multiple-**  
34 **Residential Zone (RM-7)**  
35 **(City Wide)**

36 Public Hearing to Consider a Request from Pleasant Grove City to Amend City Code Section 10-9C:  
37 Medium Multiple-Residential Zone (RM-7). The City is proposing to Make Changes to the Density,  
38 Permitted Uses, and Requirements in the RM-7 Zone.

39  
40 The above item was continued to January 11, 2024.

1 **ITEM 8 – Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment – Section 10-15-14: Flag Lots**  
2 **(City Wide)**

3 Public Hearing to Consider a Request from Pleasant Grove City to Amend City Code Section 1015-  
4 14, Flag Lots. The City is proposing to Make Changes to the Zoning Requirements for the Potential  
5 Development of Interior Lots with the Intent to Facilitate the Development of Infill Areas in an  
6 Orderly and Reasonable Manner.

7  
8 The above item was continued to January 11, 2024.

9  
10 **ITEM 9 – Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment – Section 11-7: Plan and Plat Requirements**  
11 **(City Wide)**

12 Public Hearing to Consider a Request from Pleasant Grove City to Amend City Code Section 11-7:  
13 Plan and Plat Requirements. The City is proposing to Make Changes to the Review and Approval  
14 Process for Subdivisions.

15  
16 The above item was continued to January 11, 2024.

17  
18 **ITEM 10 – Public Hearing: Code Text Amendment – Section 10-6-2: Definitions**  
19 **(City Wide)**

20 Public Hearing to Consider a Request from Pleasant Grove City to Amend City Code Section 10-62:  
21 Definitions. The City is proposing to Make Changes to the Definitions of “Lot Coverage” and Create  
22 New Definitions for the Term “Enclosed”.


23  
24 The above item was continued to January 11, 2024.

25  
26 **Review and Approve the Minutes from the November 16, 2023, Meeting.**

27  
28 **MOTION:** Commissioner Patten moved to APPROVE the minutes from November 16, 2023.  
29 Commissioner Martineau seconded the motion. The Commissioners unanimously voted “Aye”. The  
30 motion carried.

31  
32 The Planning Commission Meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

33  
34  
35  
36   
37 \_\_\_\_\_  
38 Planning Commission Chair

39   
40 \_\_\_\_\_  
41 Christina Gregory, Planning and Zoning Assistant

42 11/11/2024  
43 \_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved